

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-14 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 14 are independent.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 14 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takatori (US 6,252,629) in view of Kato (JP 2003-134431). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that "**prior to the search** for the extension keyword is set an incremental extension time period by which the recording end time is to be delayed **for each broadcast program detected** as a result of the search." Support for this amendment can be found in the original specification, e.g., at [0025].

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Takatori and Kato.

According to Takatori, after the detector (54) searches the program information in order to detect disrupter candidate programs (Sdp), the list producer (200) displays a list of such programs (Tdp) so that the user can decide whether to extend the scheduled time-recording end time (Sret) (see col. 10, line 20 to col. 11, line 34; Fig. 4). In Takatori, the user is allowed to specify the prolonging time (Tp) by which the time-recording end time is delayed (see steps S16-S20 of Fig. 4). As such, Takatori does not disclose setting an incremental extension time period for each detected program **prior to the search**, as claimed.

Further, Kato requires analyzing the electronic program guide (EPG) information to determine the extra time by which a broadcast program might be extended (see [0056] and

[0065]). Since Kato uses this information to determine how long a recording end-time should be delayed (see, e.g., [0070]-[0071]), it is clear that Kato sets the incremental extension time **during** the search of the EPG information. Furthermore, when Kato detects multiple broadcast programs that might be extended, Kato determines the extension time for each separately. Therefore, Kato does not disclose setting an incremental extension time **prior to the search**, nor does Kato disclose using the same incremental extension time **for each detected program**, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 8 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Takatori and Kato, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2, 4, 9, and 11, Applicants submit that these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 8 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 9, and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 8. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner states that claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in this application.

Claims 7 and 14 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of base claims 1 and 8, respectively.<sup>1</sup>

#### **Additional Cited References**

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the subject matter incorporated into claims 7 and 14 have been slightly modified to recite "first broadcast program" and "second broadcast program," to more clearly provide antecedent basis for "the second broadcast program" in the final clause. Applicants submit that such revisions do not substantively narrow the scope of claims 7 and 14, and thus do not give rise to any estoppel.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Registration No. 47305) at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: December 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

 #47,305  
Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000